

**PRELIMINARY REPORT
2005-2006 RETRAINING GRANT PROGRAM**

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

The Education Accountability Act of 1998 (§59-18-1560) establishes grant programs for schools designated as Below Average or Unsatisfactory:

The State Board of Education, working with the Accountability Division and the Department of Education, must establish grant programs for schools designated as below average and for schools designated as unsatisfactory. A school designated as below average will qualify for a grant to undertake any needed retraining of school faculty and administration once the revised plan is determined by the State Department of Education to meet the criteria on high standards and effective activities. A school designated as unsatisfactory will qualify for the grant program after the State Board of Education approves its revised plan. A grant or a portion of a grant may be renewed annually over the next three years, if school and district actions to implement the revised plan continue. Should student performance not improve, any revisions to the plan must meet high standards prior to renewal of the grant. The revised plan must be reviewed by the district and board of trustees and the State Department of Education to determine what other actions, if any, need to be taken. A grant may be extended for up to two additional years, if the State Board of Education determines it is needed to sustain academic improvement. The funds must be expended based on the revised plan and according to criteria established by the State Board of Education. Prior to extending any grant, the Accountability Division shall review school expenditures to make a determination of the effective use of previously awarded grant funds. If deficient use is determined, those deficiencies must be identified, noted, and corrective action taken before a grant extension will be given.

Provisos regarding the Retraining Grant Program have been in the appropriations acts beginning with Fiscal Year 2001-02. Pertinent provisos included in the Appropriations Act for FY2007 are:

1A.44. (SDE-EIA: Technical Assistance) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in order to best meet the needs of low-performing schools, funds appropriated for homework centers, teacher specialists, principal specialists, retraining grants, technical assistance to below average schools, and principal leaders must be allocated accordingly. Schools receiving an absolute rating of below average must submit to the Department of Education a school renewal plan that includes actions consistent with each of the alternative researched-based technical assistance criteria as approved by the Education Oversight Committee and the Department of Education. Upon approval of the plans by the Department of Education and the State Board of Education, the school will receive an allocation of not less than \$75,000, taking into consideration the enrollment of the schools. The funds must be expended on strategies and activities as expressly outlined in the school renewal plan which may include, but are not limited to, professional development, the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), homework centers, diagnostic testing, supplement health and social services, or comprehensive school reform efforts. The schools will work with the Department of Education to broker the services of technical assistance personnel

as needed and as stipulated in the school renewal plan. Funds not expended in the current fiscal year may be carried forward and expended for the same purpose in the next fiscal year.

Schools receiving an absolute rating of unsatisfactory will be provided an external review team evaluation. Based upon the external review team evaluation, the schools must submit to the Department of Education a school renewal plan that includes actions consistent with the alternative research-based technical assistance criteria as approved by the Education Oversight Committee and the Department of Education. Upon approval of the plan by the Department of Education and the State Board of Education, the schools will receive an allocation of not less than \$250,000, taking into consideration the enrollment of the schools and the recommendations of the external review team. The funds must be expended on strategies and activities as expressly outlined in the school renewal plan which may include, but are not limited to, professional development, the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), homework centers, diagnostic testing, supplement health and social services, or comprehensive school reform efforts. The schools will work with the Department of Education to broker the services of technical assistance personnel as needed and as stipulated in the school renewal plan. Funds not expended in the current fiscal year may be carried forward and expended for the same purpose in the next fiscal year.

With the funds appropriated to the Department of Education for technical assistance services, the department will assist schools with an absolute rating of unsatisfactory or below average in designing and implementing school renewal plans and in brokering for technical assistance personnel as needed and as stipulated in the school renewal plan. In addition, the department must monitor the expenditure of funds and the academic achievement in schools receiving these funds and report to the General Assembly and the Education Oversight Committee by January 1 of 2007 and then by January 1 of each fiscal year following as the General Assembly may direct.

and

1A.47. (SDE-EIA: XI.A.4-Retraining Grants) Funds appropriated for retraining grants in the prior fiscal year may be retained and expended during the current fiscal year by the schools that were awarded the grants during the prior fiscal year for the same purpose. Funds appropriated for Retraining Grants may be used for training for superintendents and school board members. Beginning with the 2004 annual school report card, a school initially designated as unsatisfactory or below average on the current year's report card must receive by January 1, \$10,000 from the funds appropriated for Retraining Grants and must expend the funds for planning purposes in accordance with Section 59-18-1560. The school is then eligible to receive additional retraining grant allocations in the following three school years in accordance with Section 59-18-1560 provided that the school meets the guidelines developed by the Department. A school designated as unsatisfactory or below average for consecutive years may combine the additional retraining grants allocations and homework center allocations for professional development or for extended school day in accordance with the school's improvement plan. Furthermore, any school that does not provide the evaluation information necessary to determine effective use as required by Section 59-18-1560 is not eligible to receive additional funding until the requested data is provided as outlined in the program guidelines.

OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

The history of the Retraining Grant program has been chronicled in previous reports that can be viewed at http://www.sceoc.com/PDF/Retraining_Grant_Program_2003_04_Final_Report.pdf and <http://www.sceoc.com/PDF/reports/Retrainingstudy2005.pdf>. The academic year 2005-06 was the seventh year of the program and the fifth year that awarding of a Retraining Grant was based on the Absolute report card rating. Administration of the program is the responsibility of the Office of School Quality in the South Carolina State Department of Education (SDE).

Prior to 2001-02, schools that received Retraining Grants were located in the seven school districts that were listed as “impaired.” Since 2001, schools that receive an Absolute rating of Unsatisfactory or Below Average on the annual school report card automatically qualify for the program. The statistical evolution of the program is outlined in Table 1.

Table 1
Statistical History of the Program


Fiscal Year	Appropriation	# of schools	Amount per certificated staff
1998-1999	\$750,000	30	\$838.04
1999-2000	\$750,000	30	\$838.04
2000-2001	\$750,000	30	\$838.04
2001-2002	\$4,875,000	256	\$500 Unsatisfactory Schools \$330 Below Average Schools
2002-2003	\$9,265,645	271	\$550
2003-2004	\$9,265,645	276	\$550
2004-2005	\$7,460,500	285	\$450 / \$10,000 planning grant for new schools
2005-2006	\$5,565,000	307	\$450 / \$10,000 planning grant for new schools
2006-2007	\$6,144,000	*	Money for schools from 2005-06 included in Appropriation for Below Average and Unsatisfactory schools re Proviso 1A.44. \$10,000 planning grant for new schools identified by 2006 report card

* Prior to the release of the 2006 report cards, number of schools receiving planning grant TBD.

Consolidation and/or closing of schools have led to fluctuations in the number of schools continuing from year to year. Until the 2005-06 school year, however, no school had been removed from the list due to improvement. As part of the report on the program for the 2003-04 academic year, the recommendation was made that 39 schools identified as Unsatisfactory or Below Average on the 2001 report card no longer receive Retraining Grant funds after the 2004-05 academic year because they had received Absolute ratings of Average or above on three consecutive report cards from 2002-2004. The recommendation was adopted by the State Department of Education and 39 schools exited the program at the beginning of the 2005-06 academic year.

In the report on the Retraining Grant Program for 2002-03, the recommendation was made that the “Criteria to determine the eligibility of schools that receive an absolute rating of average or above after the third year in the program should be determined prior to the end of the 2003-04 school year by the Accountability Division in consultation with the State Department of Education (SDE).” After meeting with the representatives of the Office of School Quality at the

SDE, staff from the EOC and the SDE agreed that all schools in the third year of the program, regardless of their absolute report card rating in 2004, would need to apply for the possible two year extension. The Office of School Quality designed an extension process and notified all schools of the necessary procedures to obtain an extension. Essentially, the criteria for an extension included a formal request for an extension and a pledge of assurance that deficiencies identified in the use of the retraining funds in previous reports would be corrected. A school was required to file an updated School Renewal Plan as part of the annual extension process. An issue that had to be addressed by the end of the 2005-06 academic year was the status of all schools that entered the program as a result of the 2001 report card; the three year initial grant period and the two year maximum extension period ended with the end of the academic year. At the end of the 2005-06 school year, and partly as a response to Proviso 1A.44, 53 schools whose Absolute rating in 2005 was Average or above were dropped from the technical assistance program for 2006-07. Thus, of the 307 schools that received retraining grant funds in 2005-06, 254 received technical assistance funds, of which retraining grant funds are a part, for the 2006-07 school year.



Over the last five years the SDE Office of School Quality has distributed \$29,433,090 to the eligible schools; \$4,426,449 in 2001-02, \$6,888,985 in 2002-03, \$6,943,511 in 2003-04, \$5,616,150 in 2004-05, and \$5,557,995 in 2005-06. According to the responses from the schools to the survey conducted by the Accountability Division over the past five years, the schools reported spending a total of \$25,997,919.20 on retraining grant activities, or 88% of the distributed funds. This figure is incomplete because fifteen schools did not report how they spent the money during the 2002-03 school year and does not necessarily include the money transferred by school districts from the program to other activities through the flexibility provision. Neither does it include any monies which may have been returned to the state if a school could not spend the money over a two year period. The percent spent is down from 89% spent through the 2004-05 school year. One reason the percent spent dropped is that many of the schools that received a planning grant in 2005-06 did not spend any money because they did not know they had the money to spend. SDE transferred the money to the school districts in January 2006, but the schools did not receive notification that the money was available from the Office of School Quality; most did not realize they received the money until they were contacted by the Accountability Division for an explanation of how the money was spent.

Additionally, the fact that schools have professional development money from other sources complicates the ability to spend all of the retraining grant funds. The retraining grant funds are to supplement, not supplant existing district funds, thus the district funds are to be expended as well. Some schools receive Title I funds. Of the 307 schools that received retraining grants in 2005-06, 192 received Title I professional development funds. Professional development enhancement monies from the lottery and funds from reading initiatives further complicate the ability of schools to expend the retraining grant funds. Additionally, the record keeping for the

different revenue sources may not be the responsibility nor available at the school level. It is probable that some of the retraining grant schools simply have resources or access to services beyond what they can reasonably utilize during a given year.

PROCEDURES FOR THE REVIEW

The Accountability Division relied on information from several sources to complete this study. From the State Department of Education (SDE) the "Guidelines for the Retraining Assistance Grants for School Faculty and Administration" (see Appendix B) and copies of the School Renewal Plans approved by SDE for each qualifying school were consulted. Previous reports prepared by the Accountability Division on the Retraining Grant Program for school years 1998-99 through 2004-05 also were reviewed. In addition, academic achievement data as reported on the annual school report cards for the 2005-06 school year will be reviewed after the release of the annual school report cards. Responses to an on-line questionnaire co-authored by the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) and SDE staffs and administered by the EOC staff comprised the bulk of the remaining information studied (see Appendix C for a copy of the survey). The on-line survey includes information regarding amount of funds spent, the number of teachers and administrators served and explanations of the use of funds. The survey also gathers important demographic information on the school, including the length of service at the school by the principal and the teachers, the education level of both groups, and the years of experience of both groups. Finally, the survey gathered information from the principal on the benefits of the Retraining Grant Program, support for the program from the superintendent and school board, and the availability of funding and consultant services.

Schools and district offices will be asked to review the information in this report and provide feedback and supporting information for data considered incorrect or incomplete. School and district officials will have until November 28, 2006 to submit pertinent additional information. A final report will be issued prior to the end of 2006.

The survey mentioned above is sent to each school receiving Retraining Grant funds. Principals and superintendents received notification of the need to complete the survey at the end of May 2006. Available on-line, principals initially had six weeks to complete the survey. By the end of the allotted time, just over ninety percent of the principals had completed the survey. The deadline was extended for two additional weeks. At the final deadline, information on all 307 schools had been received on all parts of the survey, a response rate of 100 percent. The excellent response rate probably was influenced by an amendment to proviso 1A.47 of the Appropriations Act of 2004 and continued in the Appropriations Acts of 2005 and 2006. The amendment reads: ". . . Furthermore, any school that does not provide the evaluation information necessary to determine effective use as required by Section 59-18-1560 is not eligible to receive additional funding until the requested data is provided as outlined in the program guidelines."

The survey consisted of five parts. The first part is essentially a registration area where school name, principal's name, amount of grant awarded, amount of grant spent, and similar questions are asked. Portions of part one, including the school's BEDS code, amount of the grant from the state for both 2004-05 and 2005-06, were preloaded to assist the principal in completing the survey. Principals logged on to the survey using their BEDS code in order to match the respondent to the school. A respondent was required to complete part one of the survey in order to proceed with the remainder of the survey. One question in part one of the survey asked principals if any of the funds were used flexibly, and if so, how much. Eight percent of schools reported spending any of the available funds flexibly, while ninety-two percent stated no funds were spent flexibly. All total, \$200,954 of the \$5,557,995 (3.6 percent) was spent flexibly, according to self reported data. The funds diverted were diverted to the operation of homework

centers under the provisions in Proviso 1A.47 that allowed schools to combine retraining grant funds and homework center funds as needed. Table 2 breaks out the funds received and spent by Absolute school rating on the 2005 report card.

Table 2
Retraining Grant Funds by 2005 Absolute Rating

School Rating	Amount Received (%)	Amount Spent (%)	Amount Diverted (%)
Excellent	\$135,045 (2.4)	\$123,706 (2.3)	\$0 (0)
Good	\$138,150 (2.5)	\$133,793 (2.5)	\$7,234 (4)
Average	\$702,180 (12.6)	\$679,936 (12.9)	\$63,006 (31)
Below Average	\$3,382,740 (60.9)	\$3,286,575 (62.2)	\$104,714 (52)
Unsatisfactory	\$1,151,730 (20.7)	\$1,016,671 (19.2)	\$26,000 (13)
*No rating	\$48,150 (.9)	\$47,011 (.9)	\$0 (0)
All Schools	\$5,557,995 (100)	\$5,287,692 (100)	\$200,954 (100)

* Schools with no rating are schools that received funds due to consolidation with schools receiving funds in the past, reconfiguration, or other documented change, but have not received a report card of its own.

Part two of the survey requests information on the principal. The questions include information on the educational level of the principal, years of experience as a principal and in education as a whole, and information on how long the principal has been at the school. Information on the principal is requested in order to track the stability and experience of the leadership at the school. It should be noted that 77 percent of the principals at schools receiving retraining grants have been at the school five years or less, a decrease of three percent from the 2004-05 survey; seventeen percent of the principals have been at the school 6-10 years, and only six percent have been at the school over ten years. While the vast majority of the principals have been at the school five years or less, half of the principals have been a principal somewhere for six or more years, and more than ninety-five percent of the principals have been educators for over ten years.

Part three of the survey requests information on the certificated staff. Questions include information on the number of certificated staff positions at the school, number of non-certificated teachers at the school, number of teachers participating in the Teacher Loan Program, and educational level of the certificated staff. Information on teacher turnover, educational experience of the staff and longevity of the staff at the school also is collected in order to track teacher turnover at the school over the life of the grant. Teacher stability and educational level of the teaching staff are important to the potential success of the Retraining Grant Program, for if the staff of a school is constantly changing year after year, the long-term impact of the Retraining Grant Program at the school will be significantly reduced. Table 3 provides information on certification issues at the schools receiving Retraining Grants.

Table 3
Teacher Certification

School Rating	Certificated Staff	Teaching Positions	Certified Teachers	% Certified
Excellent	335	324	317	97.8
Good	1,219	1,197	1,147	95.8
Average	3,807	3,476	3,379	97.2
Below Average	6,159	5,791	5,571	96.2
Unsatisfactory	1,371	1,269	1,197	94.3
*No rating	107	98	94	95.9
Totals	12,998	12,155	11,705	96.3

* Schools with no rating are schools that received funds due to consolidation with schools receiving funds in the past, reconfiguration, or other documented change, but have not received a report card of its own.

Information from part three of the survey reveals important data. The Retraining Grant schools employed 12,998 certificated personnel. There were 12,155 teaching positions. Of the teachers in the retraining grants schools, 30% had five or fewer years teaching experience. Even more interesting is the fact that 5,657 out of the 12,155 teachers (46.5%) had been at their present school five or fewer years, an improvement from 50.3% the previous year. However, it is still difficult to maintain school improvement when teacher turnover prevents sustained concentration on identified professional development activities.

Tables 4 and 5
Retraining Grant Schools' Teacher Data
2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06

Years Teaching	Number 03-04	% 03-04	Number 04-05	% 04-05	Number 05-06	% 05-06
First Year	720	7	875	8	1,038	9
1-5 Years	2,347	23	2,312	21	2,564	21
6-10 Years	1,865	18	2,132	19	2,367	19
11-15 Years	1,435	14	1,660	15	1,848	15
16+ Years	3,877	38	4,222	38	4,338	36

Years Teaching at that School	Number 03-04	Percentage 03-04	Number 04-05	Percentage 04-05	Number 05-06	Percentage 05-06
First Year	1,374	13	1,860	17	1,658	14
1-5 Years	3,827	37	3,768	34	3,999	33
6-10 Years	1,944	19	2,227	20	2,439	20
11-15 Years	1,152	11	1,368	12	1,417	12
16+ Years	1,947	19	1,978	18	2,642	22

One other fact from the teacher portion of the survey is interesting. Of the 12,155 teachers, 6,081 (50.03%) have a bachelors or a bachelors +18 certificate, up from 49.85% in 2004-05. Of the remaining 6,074, only 119 have a doctorate and corresponding certification. According to the 2005 report card, the median district in South Carolina has 50% of their teachers with advanced degrees, so the average percentage of faculty with advanced degrees at retraining grant schools is in line with that number.

However, faculty turnover remains an issue. Table 6 shows the teacher turnover rate for schools by Absolute rating. Overall, the principals reported that they expected, at a minimum, eighteen percent of the teachers to not return to their 2005-06 school in 2006-07.

Table 6
Teacher Turnover by School Rating

School Rating	Teaching positions	Teachers not Returning	Percentage not returning
Excellent	324	36	11.1
Good	1,197	162	13.5
Average	3,476	454	13.1
Below Average	5,791	1,247	21.5
Unsatisfactory	1,269	301	23.7
No rating	98	12	12.2
Total	12,155	2,212	18.2

* Schools with no rating are schools that received funds due to consolidation with schools receiving funds in the past, reconfiguration, or other documented change, but have not received a report card of its own.

Part four of the survey contained Likert scale questions focusing on five areas: the Retraining Grant Program, Funding, the Planning Process, Support for the Program, and General Information on the activities conducted. Respondents were asked to respond to 33 statements by choosing Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree from a pull down menu. Responses to the statements are contained in the table on the next page.

The responses to the Likert scale questions bear some reflection. The 2005-06 results are lower overall in satisfaction than the 2004-05 and 2003-04 results. Over 98 percent of respondents in 2003-04 and 2004-05 indicated that teachers benefited from the Retraining Grant Program and 97 percent responded that the teachers use what they learn through the program in class. In 2005-06, however, 91 percent of respondents indicated that teachers benefited from the Retraining Grant Program and 90 percent responded that the teachers use what they learn through the program in class. Only 84 percent of respondents in 2005-06 believed that student achievement was affected by the program; in 2003-04 92 percent and in

Table 7
Likert Scale Response Count

STATEMENTS	RESPONSES					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Undecided	Did Not Respond
Section I. The Program						
Teachers benefited from the program	67%	24%	0%	1%	6%	1%
Teachers used in class what they learned	50%	40%	0%	1%	7%	1%
Teachers felt pressured by the program	1%	8%	51%	26%	12%	1%
Student achievement was affected positively	38%	46%	0%	1%	12%	1%
Staff responsibilities for activities were identified	40%	51%	<1%	1%	5%	1%
The program fostered improved instruction	50%	40%	0%	1%	7%	1%
Procedures exist to evaluate effectiveness of the program based on student needs and state assessment scores	37%	50%	3%	1%	7%	1%
Procedures exist to evaluate effectiveness of the program based on the school's Parental Involvement Goal(s)	23%	48%	6%	1%	20%	1%
Section II. Funding						
Funding was available in a timely manner	55%	31%	4%	3%	5%	1%
Funding was available for innovative professional development	60%	33%	0%	1%	5%	1%
The program adequately supported the implementation of the SR	58%	35%	1%	1%	3%	1%
District procurement procedures did not hinder the process	43%	46%	3%	1%	6%	1%
SDE procurement procedures did not hinder the process	51%	38%	<1%	1%	8%	1%
Consultant resources were available	44%	44%	2%	1%	7%	1%
Section III. The Planning Process						
Guidelines for the Retraining Grant Program were clear	45%	43%	4%	1%	6%	1%
The SDE Model Revision Process for the program is practical	35%	50%	2%	1%	11%	1%
SDE assistance was available	45%	46%	1%	1%	6%	1%
SDE assistance was utilized	29%	52%	9%	1%	7%	1%
Timeline for the Retraining Grant did not hinder implementation	38%	47%	4%	2%	7%	1%
Faculty were involved in the planning process	48%	47%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Section IV. Support						
The school board was supportive of the Retraining Grant activities	50%	40%	<1%	1%	7%	1%
The superintendent was supportive of the Retraining Grant activities	61%	30%	<1%	1%	6%	1%
GENERAL INFORMATION						
Professional development was scheduled to minimize teacher absences during class time	49%	40%	3%	1%	5%	2%
Professional development was scheduled at times teachers could attend	50%	43%	0%	1%	4%	2%
Each activity was evaluated for effectiveness throughout the year	34%	53%	1%	1%	8%	2%
Teachers had adequate time to practice skills learned	38%	51%	2%	1%	5%	2%
Professional development emphasized active participant involvement	49%	44%	0%	1%	4%	2%
Professional development activities were based on research	56%	37%	0%	1%	4%	2%
Professional development activities were aligned with previous activities	49%	42%	0%	1%	6%	2%
Administrators participated in the professional develop. activities with teachers	56%	37%	1%	2%	4%	2%

2004-05 94 percent believed student achievement was affected positively by what teachers learned through the program. The vast majority of respondents continued to believe that local school boards and superintendents supported the activities held at the school through the program, though the overall percentages were lower. The percentage of principals responding undecided for each question increased, with the principals who did not know the money was available choosing this option almost every time.

In 2002-03, fifteen percent of respondents expressed some discontent with the funding process, but in 2003-04 and 2004-05 less than five percent of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the funding process. The rate of discontent climbed to 13% in 2005-06, probably because the schools new to the program did not know the money was available. The lowest satisfaction level was with district procurement procedures, and even in this area 89% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that district funding procedures did not hinder implementation of the program. The change in attitude towards the funding process in 2003-04 and 2004-05 is attributable to the changes in the program implementation: the funding was provided at the beginning of the school year; the program no longer operated on a reimbursement model; and, carry-over funds were available for use by the schools. Those feelings persisted with the schools continuing in the programs, but discontent was found among the new schools.

The overall positive responses of the principals raises an important question: If teachers are benefiting from the program and student achievement is being affected positively, why are the ratings data not showing improvement? Perhaps one answer is that the schools are not planning sufficient activities in all of the core disciplines, or in areas that affect the school ratings like student retention (graduation rate). Or, perhaps the professional development activities being conducted remain more traditional in nature and more innovative instructional measures are not being introduced. Regardless of the answer, the principals who have participated in the program more than one year view the program positively.

In previous years the schools entering the program for the first time had complained that the year was essentially over by the time they received their money after submitting and obtaining approval of their School Renewal Plan by SDE by the end of April. With only two months left in the fiscal year, schools new to the program were unable to benefit from their allotment. Previous reports on the Retraining Grant Program highlighted this issue and in the 2002-03 report the recommendation was made that a "planning grant" be developed for schools new to the program during a given academic year. In the FY2006 budget, proviso 1A.47 established a planning grant for schools new to the program and also preserves the full three year Retraining Grant Program for these same schools. ". . .Beginning with the 2004 annual school report card, a school initially designated as unsatisfactory or below average on the current year's report card must receive by January 1, \$10,000 from the funds appropriated for Retraining Grants and must expend the funds for planning purposes in accordance with Section 59-18-1560. The school is then eligible to receive additional retraining grant allocations in the following three school years in accordance with Section 59-18-1560 provided that the school meets the guidelines developed by the Department. . . ." Forty-seven schools received planning grants during the 2005-06 academic year but few made use of the money because most the principals did not know the money had been transferred from SDE to the school district. Schools could not make efficient use of the money as they were unaware the money was available and the opportunity to use the money to develop a vibrant School Renewal Plan that would impact student achievement was lost. The breakdown in communication regarding the availability of funds must be rectified in the future so that schools new to the program have an opportunity to sufficiently utilize the funds.

Part five of the survey requested information on the specific activities funded through the Retraining Grant Program. Respondents could provide up to seven different activities. Information requested on each activity included whether the activity was a continuation of an earlier activity. Respondents also provided information on the content area the activity

addressed, the format of the activity, the objective or strategy the activity addressed from the School Renewal Plan of the school, how many teachers and administrators participated in the activity, and what kind of follow-up was provided for the activity.

The number of activities reported by 307 schools in 2005-06 was 946, down from 976 in 2004-05, and down from 1,092 in 2003-04 (one school responded to the survey but reported no activities). In 2003-04, the average number of activities per school was just under four per school, in 2004-05 the average was just under three and a half, but in 2005-06, the average was just over three per school. Twenty eight schools, all new to the program, reported no activities. Additional activities could have been initiated since the schools were limited to only seven activities, but only 33 schools reported initiating seven activities. Of the 946 activities, over 70 percent were continuations of the previous year's professional development activities, an increase from the 68 percent reported as continuations in 2004-05. The attempt by many schools to continue implementation of previous activities is important because it takes three to five years to institutionalize procedures learned through professional development activities in the school. Changing activities too frequently has been a major criticism by educators of professional development initiatives in the past; they barely have a chance to learn about the activity before they are being asked to learn another, sometimes contradictory, teaching method. Care is being given by the schools to make sure that professional development initiatives funded by the retraining grant program are fully implemented and institutionalized before new initiatives are started. Schools were also given the opportunity to report activities on which they continued implementation but on which the expenditure of money was not needed and many schools responded to the inquiry positively.

As part of the review of the Retraining Grant program, the activities submitted by the schools were analyzed for common topics or professional development activities. Nine key areas for professional development were identified for analysis. The key areas were: reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, classroom management or discipline, best practices, curriculum alignment or development, and assessment and testing. The key areas are listed on the left hand side of the following table and the frequency by school level (elementary, middle, and high) follow. Schools that cover more than one level, such as a K-8 school or a 7-12 school were not separated but are part of the total column. Some activities reported by the schools count in more than one key area, such as when a school reports mathematics curriculum development or reading and writing across the disciplines. Though the analysis is not scientific, it provides a glimpse of the primary activities conducted under the Retraining Grant Program.

Table 8
Professional Development Topics

Key Area	Total 04-05	Total 05-06	Elem 04-05	Elem 05-06	Mid 04-05	Mid 05-06	High 04-05	High 05-06
Reading	152	109	79	51	39	27	29	24
Writing	83	62	39	30	19	19	23	7
Mathematics	146	115	78	48	39	29	23	21
Science	49	73	24	36	13	17	11	8
Social Studies	23	27	14	15	3	10	5	2
Classroom Management	45	34	19	12	12	8	13	8
Best Practices	80	75	37	34	21	18	21	15
Curriculum Alignment	141	111	52	42	36	33	52	30
Assessment	76	66	31	29	20	21	25	12

For elementary and middle schools, the number of professional development activities reported for science and social studies is disproportionately less than activities for mathematics and language arts for the second year in a row. Perhaps in view of the impact of those disciplines on the Absolute ratings of the 2005, and eventually the 2006 and 2007 report cards, schools should provide additional activities that improve curriculum, instruction, and assessment in science and social studies.

Additional analysis will be done of the 307 schools using the 2005 state report card upon the release of the annual report cards. Of the 307 schools receiving retraining grant funds in 2005-06, 200 schools remained from the first year of 2001-02. The number is smaller than the initial year because several schools have been consolidated or closed and 23 schools no longer receive funds as a result of improved performance. Of the 200 schools:

- 82 were elementary schools, 78 were middle schools and 40 were high schools.
- 0 (16.8%) received an absolute rating of Below Average or Unsatisfactory in 2001, but on the four subsequent report cards issued in 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005, they received a rating of Average or above.
- 12 (6%) have been Unsatisfactory on all five report cards.
- 48 (24%) have been Below Average on all five report cards.
- 48 (24%) have fluctuated between Unsatisfactory and Below Average on the five report cards.
- 92 (46%) have been rated Average or above at least once on the 2002, 2003, 2004 or 2005 report cards.

Table 9
Report Card Analysis of Schools Receiving Retraining Grants
2001-02 through 2005-06

Absolute rating	Total	Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
Unsatisfactory all five report cards	12	0	8	4
Below Average all five report cards	48	17	27	4
Unsatisfactory or Below Average all five report cards	48	13	25	10
Average and above after 2001 report card	0	0	0	0
Fluctuating between Average and above and Unsatisfactory and Below Average	92	52	18	22
Total	200	82	78	40

The middle schools remain an area of concern; 60 of the 78 (76.9%) schools identified in 2001 as Below Average or Unsatisfactory have remained so, compared to 30 of 82 elementary schools (36.6%) and 18 of 40 high schools (45%).

On the 2005 report card 39 schools that scored Below Average or Unsatisfactory on the 2001 report card scored Average or above on each report card between 2003 and 2005. However, of the 39 schools that had received Absolute ratings of Average or above on each of the report cards between 2002 through 2004, fifteen dropped to Below Average or Unsatisfactory on the 2005 report card (eight elementary schools, six middle schools and one high school). The challenge to get out of the Retraining Grant Program and stay out remains high. Results for the 2006 report card are not available at this time.

The statute uses the phrase “effective use” to describe the use of the funds by the receiving schools. For purposes of this evaluation, “effective use” was defined as having used the grant to implement the School Renewal Plan with the intended or expected effect of improving

professional practices, thereby resulting in higher levels of student achievement. This year a panel of three educators reviewed the activities reported by the school and compared the activities reported to the school's School Renewal Plan to determine "effective use." The panel also reviewed other data reported by the school, including the number of follow-up sessions to each activity, the participation of the school's administration in the activities, and the number of activities open to all faculty at the school.

The criteria for effective use are drawn from the 2003-04 South Carolina Department of Education Standards of Professional Development and published in the guidelines for the retraining grants. The Standards of Professional Development were revised in late spring 2004 and new standards are in place for 2004-05. The most important component of the criteria for the "effective use" review is that all activities undertaken through the Retraining Grant Program are designed to improve student learning. Effective use includes, but is not restricted to:

- Funds are expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers;
- Funds are expended in a manner that addresses the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization;
- Funds are expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants; and
- Funds are expended in a manner that recognizes differing levels of educator expertise (i. e., diverse participant needs) in regards to content knowledge and pedagogical practices.

As in previous years, deficiencies are detailed for each school that has received a retraining grant for more than one year based on the application of these criteria and after comparing the self-reported data on the survey with the School Renewal Plan submitted to SDE. Student performance data for each school as reported on the four school report cards issued between 2001 and 2005 also were part of the review for deficiencies. When the report card data is available for 2006, that data will be scrutinized as well.

The possible deficiencies are:

- Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
- Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization.
- Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.
- Funds were not expended in a manner that recognized differing levels of educator expertise (i. e., diverse participant needs) in regards to content knowledge and pedagogical practices.

Data reviewed for the first deficiency listed above included the number of teachers at the school, the number of teachers participating in the activities reported in the survey, the number of follow-up sessions to each activity and the date during the school year the activities were to be conducted according to the School Renewal Plan. *A school was reported deficient if fewer than ninety percent of its faculty participated in the activities or there were no follow-up sessions for the activities reported.*

Data reviewed for the second deficiency listed above included the number of activities reported by the schools, whether the administration participated with the faculty in the activity, whether

there were follow-up sessions scheduled for the activities reported and how they were conducted and whether the activity or activities reported were new to the school for the academic year. *A school was reported deficient if more than fifty percent of the activities reported were new to the school that year and supporting information indicated activities begun in previous years were not continued.*

Data reviewed for the third deficiency listed above included whether the activities reported were aligned with the School Renewal Plan, whether the activities were research-based, and how the activities were presented to the faculty and staff. *A school was reported as deficient if more than one-third of the activities reported were not contained in the School Renewal Plan, the activities reported were not research based, or if the method of presentation of the activities was inappropriate.*

Data reviewed for the fourth deficiency listed above included whether the activities reported were designed to include all certificated staff at the school, whether multiple formats for professional development were utilized to present the activities, and whether the activities were presented by credible providers. *A school was reported as deficient if the activities were not led by credible providers (as identified by SDE approved lists), activities were not designed to include all certificated staff at the school, or all activities were presented in the same format (format was not an issue if only one activity was reported).*

Finally, two additional items were scrutinized from the information reported by the schools for this report. According to the program guidelines (see Appendix B) developed by the SDE, funds provided through the Retraining Grant Program are to be used for professional development only; funding of activities other than professional development activities is an inappropriate use of the funds according to the guidelines; three schools have been cited for spending funds on items outside the program guidelines. Too, principals are asked to report the total amount of funds spent from the Retraining Grant Program during the year and how those funds were divided among the various reported activities. Of the 259 schools continuing in the program from 2004-05, 104 schools (40.1%) provided insufficient detail on how the total funds were spent. Insufficient detail was noted when a school provided explanation for less than 80% of the total amount reported spent (e.g., a principal reported spending \$25,100 in Retraining Grant funds but provided detail on only \$11,000).

No deficiencies are noted for the forty-eight schools that received money for the first time in 2005-2006 due to the resulting fact that those schools did not officially enter the program until half of the academic year had passed. Too, the funds provided those schools was for planning for use of the funds in the future based on the development of a new School Renewal Plan. And, many of those schools did not received notification that the planning grant funds were available for their use and, therefore, they did not expend the money.

In reviewing the data on the schools, the number schools receiving deficiencies in any of the four areas has fallen from 2002-03 to 2005-06. Table 10 provides a look at the number of schools receiving deficiencies in each of the four areas. The percentage of schools is based on the number of schools continuing in the program from the previous year.

Table 10
Schools Receiving Deficiencies

Deficiency	# schools 02-03 (%)	# schools 03-04 (%)	# schools 04-05 (%)	# schools 05-06 (%)
Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.	202 (91.4)	3 (1.1)	1 (.4)	15 (5.8)
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization.	220 (99.6)	76 (28.6)	26 (11.9)	66 (25.5)
Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.	197 (89.1)	88 (33.1)	21 (7.8)	17 (6.6)
Funds were not expended in a manner that recognized differing levels of educator expertise (i. e., diverse participant needs) in regards to content knowledge and pedagogical practices.	220 (99.6)	6 (2.3)	1 (.4)	0 (0)

Specific information on the individual schools is provided in Appendix A.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Retraining Grant program is at an important crossroads as part of the technical assistance provided to schools rated Unsatisfactory or Below Average on the Absolute rating of the annual school report card. Because the funds for the program are included in the technical assistance money allocated to the schools rated Unsatisfactory or Below Average on the Absolute rating as stipulated in Proviso 1A.44, the funds may be spent on technical assistance measures other than professional development. The Retraining Grant Program experiences a definitive shift from providing funds for professional development to a focus on providing schools funding to develop a strong effective School Renewal Plan that improves student achievement. Therefore, the report on the program will undergo some significant changes over the next year. The analysis of the program shifts from effective use of funds for professional development to effective use of funds for the development of the School Renewal Plan.

Implementation of the Retraining Grant Program with a large number of schools that are at different stages of the program has presented several challenges. In response to these challenges the Office of School Quality at the State Department of Education has worked diligently to resolve the various concerns documented in earlier Retraining Grant Program Reports. And, in spite of the best efforts of SDE, challenges remain. Though 88% of the funds appropriated to schools have been spent over the last five years, concern remains that some schools may have more professional development resources or services than they can reasonably access during a single school year. Thus, the need to provide funding and the training necessary to develop and follow a sound School Renewal Plan will become the focus of the Retraining Grant so changes are made in instruction at schools where student achievement and instructional practices have fallen short of desired goals in the past.

As in the past, it remains impossible to determine the effectiveness of the activities conducted by the schools receiving retraining grants because the program does not operate in a vacuum from other technical assistance efforts or programs in progress at the schools. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the Retraining Grant Program is hampered by the turnover in the administration at those schools. In addition, the annual large turnover in the teaching staff further hampers the effectiveness of the program as institutionalization of better instructional practices is limited by having to constantly train new teachers in the activities. Both the administration and teaching staff must become more stable at these schools for institutionalization, and therefore, long lasting change to occur.

The positive aspects of the Retraining Grant Program have been, and remain:

- Principals state that teachers benefit from the program and use what they learn through the program in the classroom.
- Principals state that school board members and superintendents are supportive of the Retraining Grant activities conducted at the schools.
- Principals report procedures exist for evaluation of the effectiveness of the program activities both for student achievement and parental involvement.
- School faculty are involved in the planning process.
- Professional development is scheduled to minimize teacher absences from the classroom.
- Professional development activities chosen by the schools were based on research.
- A specific planning program for implementation of the Retraining Grant Program is available from the Office of School Quality at SDE.
- All schools receiving funds under the program responded to the survey.

Additional positive aspects identified this year include:

- Fewer initial deficiencies were cited for the schools and fewer schools received deficiencies in the preliminary report.
- Schools new to the program in 2005-2006 were issued a planning grant instead of receiving a larger amount of money that they will be unable to use.

Areas of concern with the Retraining Grant Program are:

- Schools still are unable to spend the allotted funds in a single year, primarily because the school is unable to spend the first year's appropriation in the first year, leading to carry forward monies and the need to spend the carry forward money before the current school year appropriation.
- About two-fifths of the schools (40.1%) provided insufficient detail on how the total amount reported spent was actually spent.
- Teacher and administrative turnover impede institutionalization of professional development activities.

- Many of the activities funded with Retraining Grant Program funds are not in the schools' School Renewal Plans. Two of the professional development activities that often are not in the School Renewal Plans but appear in the explanations of expenditures is the school staff retreat and attendance by the administration at the Summer Leadership Conference. Professional development activities that are not in the School Renewal Plan should not be funded with Retraining Grant funds.
- Schools new to the program were not sufficiently notified by the Office of School Quality that the planning grant funds had been transferred to the district for their use; therefore, most of the funding was not utilized as it was intended – to help develop the School Renewal Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Office of School Quality should make sure that they notify the schools new to the program that the planning grant funds are available for use in developing the School Renewal Plan.
2. Schools that had carry forward funds from the program during the 2006-07 school year should be required to explain how those funds were expended.
3. Staff from SDE and the EOC should jointly determine the criteria for evaluation of effective use of funds from the planning grant and disseminate the criteria to the schools that receive the planning grant.

Appendix A

ABBEVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Abbeville High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Excellent	2004 Good	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Good
-----------------	------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------------	-----------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$19,457 spent; \$13,050 explained).

Calhoun Falls High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Good	2003 Below Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$9,422 spent; \$3,400 explained).

AIKEN COUNTY SCHOOLS

A. L. Corbett Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None

North Aiken Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Ridge Spring-Monetta Elementary/Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

Ridge Spring-Monetta High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Excellent	2003 Good	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	-----------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6
 Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

ALLENDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Allendale Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 3
Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization (Five activities reported, three of them new).

Allendale Fairfax High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None

Allendale Fairfax Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None

Fairfax Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 3
Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization.

BAMBERG COUNTY DISTRICT 1

Bamberg-Ehrhardt Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$12,600 spent; \$0 explained).

Ehrhardt Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: None.

BAMBERG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Denmark-Olar Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$9,956 spent; \$4,413 explained).

Denmark-Olar High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	-----------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 4
Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization (Four activities reported, all of them new).

Denmark-Olar Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 6
Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 2
Deficiencies: None.

BARNWELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 19

Blackville-Hilda High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Excellent	2004 Excellent	2003 Good	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None.

Blackville-Hilda Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$4,245 spent; \$3,000 explained).

BARNWELL COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 45

Guinyard-Butler Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: None.

BEAUFORT COUNTY SCHOOLS

Battery Creek High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Good	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------	-----------	--------------	--------------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 7
Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$59,013 spent; \$31,770 explained).

Beaufort Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None.

James J. Davis Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$2,449 spent; \$0 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (One new activity, no continued activities).

Lady's Island Middle

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$29,000 spent; \$18,500 explained)..

Whale Branch Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$17,550 spent; \$2,400 explained).

Whale Branch Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$22,700 spent; \$4,032 explained).

BERKELEY COUNTY SCHOOLSBerkeley Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$23,077 spent; \$8,621 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Two new activity, no continued activities).

Cainhoy Elementary/Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	----------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Cross High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

J. K. Gourdin Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (One new activity, no continued activities).

Sedgefield Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None

St. Stephen Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

St. Stephen Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$13,942 spent; \$5,000 explained).

CALHOUN COUNTY SCHOOLS**Calhoun County High School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Good	2003 Below Average	2002 Good	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	---------------------	-----------	--------------------	-----------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$19,440 spent; \$6,750 explained).

Guinyard Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

John Ford Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOLS**Alice Birney Middle School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$33,120 spent; \$10,000 explained).

Baptist Hill High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Brentwood Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$10,000 spent; \$5,000 explained).

Note: Brentwood was closed at the end of 2004-05 and reconstituted in 2005-06.

Burke Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Chicora Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Average	Average	Average	Below Average	Below Average

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants. (Three activities reported, two not found in School Renewal Plan).

Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three new activities, no continued activities).

E. B. Ellington Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Good	Average	Average	Below Average	Average

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three new activities, one continued activity).

Edith L. Frierson Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Below Average	Average	Below Average	Below Average	Average

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Edmund A. Burns Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$13,579 spent; \$6,882 explained).

Garrett Academy of Technology

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Excellent	2004 Excellent	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$27,680 spent; \$12,380 explained).

Haut Gap Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$12,375 spent; \$9,095 explained)

Jane Edwards Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Lincoln High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Good	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Two new activities, no continued activities).

Malcolm C. Hursey Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Mary Ford Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$9,497 spent; \$7,400 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the
 change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three new
 activities, no continued activities).

Matilda F. Dunston Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 5
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the
 change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Five new
 activities, one continued activity).

Memminger Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$15,300 spent; \$10,300 explained).

Midland Park Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 6 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$18,288 spent; \$9,261 explained).

Mitchell Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Morningside Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 4
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the
 change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Four new
 activities, one continued activity).

Mt. Zion Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Two new activities, no continued activity).

Murray-LaSaine Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (One new activities, no continued activity).

Norman C. Toole Military Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 7

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Seven new activities, no continued activity).

North Charleston Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

North Charleston High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Pepperhill Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

R. B. Stall High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------	---------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

R. D. Schroder Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$14,000 spent; \$6,500 explained).

St. John's High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$15,847 spent; \$10,430 explained).

Sanders Clyde Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------------	---------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$12,150 spent; \$9,189 explained).

W. B. Goodwin Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 6 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Wilmont Fraser Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Two new activities, no continued activity).

West Ashley Intermediate School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$1,000 spent; \$0 explained).

West Ashley Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$24,955 spent; \$15,251 explained).

CHEROKEE COUNTY SCHOOLSGaffney Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 4
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Four new activities, no continued activity).

John E. Ewing Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$20,250 spent; \$13,711 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three new activities, no continued activity).

Luther Vaughn Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Mary Bramlett Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

CHESTER COUNTY SCHOOLSChester Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$25,863 spent; \$2,000 explained).

Chester Sr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Good	2004 Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	-----------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$28,350 spent; \$4,447 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Two new activities, no continued activity).

Great Falls High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Good	2003 Below Average	2002 Good	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

Great Falls Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 01
 Deficiencies: None.

Lewisville Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 7
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Seven new activities, no continued activity).

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLS

Central High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Good	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------------	---------------------	-----------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$19,681 spent; \$12,401 explained).

Pageland Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 N/A	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	----------	----------	----------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Continued Activities: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: None.

CLARENDON SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Scott's Branch High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	---------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 2
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$14,175 spent; \$6,085 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Two new activities, no continued activity).

Scott's Branch Intermediate School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: None.

CLARENDON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Manning Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$22,050 spent; \$1,500 explained).

Manning Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2

Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 0

Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$18,000 spent; \$11,100 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Two new activities, no continued activity).

CLARENDON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3East Clarendon Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2

Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 1

Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

COLLETON COUNTY SCHOOLSBlack Street Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5

Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 2

Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$18,450 spent; \$9,727 explained).

Colleton County High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 N/A	2003 N/A	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6

Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 0

Number of New Activities: 6

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$63,371 spent; \$47,000 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Six new activities, no continued activity).

Colleton Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3

Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2

Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Forest Circle Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Five activities reported, only two were a continuation).

Forest Hills Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Hendersonville Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 7
 Number of Activities Continued: 7 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$28,530 spent; \$18,400 explained).

Northside Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Ruffin Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$14,400 spent; \$5,000 explained).

DARLINGTON COUNTY SCHOOLSBrunson-Dargan Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

Darlington High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$72,054 spent; \$15,426 explained).

Darlington Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: None.

Hartsville Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$29,184 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).

Lamar Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).

Rosenwald/St. David's Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Spaulding Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$8,500 spent; \$5,500 explained). Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, all of them new).

Spaulding Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Thornwell Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

West Hartsville Elementary

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

DILLON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1Lake View High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Four activities provided, three of them new).

Lake View Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: Funds were spent on items outside of program guidelines. (Supplies and materials purchased for classroom use, not professional development).

DILLON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2Dillon High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Good	2004 Good	2003 Below Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

Gordon Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

J. V. Martin Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$18,675 spent; \$2,000 explained). Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (One activity provided, it was new).

DORCHESTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 4

Harleyville-Ridgeville Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$13,863 spent; \$6,400 explained).

St. George Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$18,923 spent; \$0 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (One activity provided, it was new).

Woodland High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Good	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------	--------------	------------------------	------------------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 5
Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Six activities provided, five of them new).

EDGEFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLS

Douglas Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3
Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, all of them new).

Johnston-Edgefield-Trenton Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3
Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, all of them new).

FAIRFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLS

Fairfield Central High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$49,724 spent; \$24,900 explained).

Fairfield Intermediate School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Fairfield Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: None.

Fairfield Primary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------	-----------------	------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: None.

Geiger Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Kelly Miller Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 6 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

FLORENCE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Dewey Carter Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$9,000 spent; \$0 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).
Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

North Vista Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$25,020 spent; \$9,000 explained).

Southside Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Williams Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$24,750 spent; \$0 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).
Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Wilson Senior High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below	2004 Below	2003 Below	2002 Below	2001 Below
-----------------	------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

		Average	Average	Average	Average	Average
Number of Activities Reported:	5	Number Matching SRP:	3			
Number of Activities Continued:	4	Number of New Activities:	1			
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$24,570 spent; \$12,000 explained).						

FLORENCE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3

Lake City Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------	----------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$18,450 spent; \$2,636 explained).

Lake City High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: None.

Main Street Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None.

J. Paul Truluck Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3
Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, all of them new).

Olanta Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Good	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------	-----------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None.

Ronald E. McNair Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average

Number of Activities Reported: 4

Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 0

Number of New Activities: 4

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Four activities provided, all of them new).

FLORENCE SCHOOL DISTRICT 4**Brockington Elementary School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Below Average

Number of Activities Reported: 2

Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 1

Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$16,169 spent; \$8,638 explained).

Johnson Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Number of Activities Reported: 7

Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 0

Number of New Activities: 7

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Seven activities provided, all of them new).

Timmons ville High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average

Number of Activities Reported: 3

Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3

Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

GEORGETOWN COUNTY SCHOOLS**Browns Ferry Elementary School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Below Average	Average

Number of Activities Reported: 7

Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 4

Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: None.

Carver's Bay Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average

Number of Activities Reported: 3

Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2

Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Georgetown Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$39,700 spent; \$11,000 explained).

Plantersville Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Good	2003 Good	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Rosemary Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

GREENVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLSAlexander Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$14,045 spent; \$9,105 explained).

Beck Academy School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities:
 Deficiencies: None.

Berea Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Carolina High School and Academy

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$13,394 spent; \$9,400 explained).

Cherrydale Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 N/A	2003 N/A	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Grove Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$20,745 spent; \$0 explained).

Hollis Academy

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$20,652 spent; \$338 explained).

Lakeview Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Monaview Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants. (Six activities reported, only three found in the School Renewal Plan).

Southside High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$27,810 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).
 Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
 Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Tanglewood Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$16,256 spent; \$9,078 explained).

Woodmont High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$28,350 spent; \$18,846 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Four activities were reported, three new to the school).
 Funds were spent on items outside of program guidelines. (Supplies and materials purchased for classroom use, not professional development).

Woodmont Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$26,302 spent; \$13,000 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).

GREENWOOD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 51

Ware Shoals Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 7
Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Seven activities provided, all of them new).

HAMPTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Fennell Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Good
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	-----------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$12,150 spent; \$0 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).
Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

North District Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$25,000 spent; \$12,000 explained).

HAMPTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

Estill Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 2
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$21,600 spent; \$12,500 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Two activities provided, both of them new).

Estill High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, all of them new).

Estill Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 7

Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: None.

HORRY COUNTY SCHOOLS**Conway High School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Excellent	Good	Good	Below Average	Good

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: None.

Loris High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Average	Good	Average	Below Average	Good

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$27,000 spent; \$13,770 explained).

Loris Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Below Average	Average	Average	Average	Below Average

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 4

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).

JASPER COUNTY SCHOOLS**Jasper County High School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
		Below Average	Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 5

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).

Ridgeland Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$29,700 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).
 Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
 Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Ridgeland Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$27,810 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, two of them new).
 Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
 Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

West Hardeeville Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

KERSHAW COUNTY SCHOOLSNorth Central Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------	----------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: None

LANCASTER COUNTY SCHOOLS

A.R. Rucker Middle School,

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$23,876 spent; \$13,750 explained).

South Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: None.

LAURENS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 56

Bell Street Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 2
Deficiencies: None

Martha Dendy Sixth Grade Center

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 N/A	2003 N/A	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 7
Number of Activities Continued: 6 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$9,180 spent; \$5,429 explained).

M. S. Bailey Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None.

LEE COUNTY SCHOOLS

Bishopville Primary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: None.

Dennis Intermediate School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Lee Central High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$25,200 spent; \$19,000 explained).

Lower Lee Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$10,810 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the
 change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No
 activities provided).
 Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new
 behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
 Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision
 making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with
 feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Mount Pleasant Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 4
 Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the
 change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Four
 activities provided, all of them new).

West Lee Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: None.

LEXINGTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 4

Sandhills Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None.

Swansea High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Good	2002 Good	2001 Good
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None.

MARION COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1

Johnakin Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2
Deficiencies: None.

Marion Intermediate School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$23,913 spent; \$0 explained).

MARION COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2

McCormick Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: None.

Palmetto Elementary/Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Funds were spent on items outside of program guidelines. (Supplies and materials purchased for classroom use, not professional development).

MARION COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 7Brittons Neck Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None

Creek Bridge Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 N/A	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------------	------------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6
 Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Rains-Centenary Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: None.

MARLBORO COUNTY SCHOOLSBennettsville Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Bennettsville Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Blenheim Elementary/Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 7

Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: None.

Clio Elementary/Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, all of them new).

Marlboro County High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 4

Deficiencies: Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Five activities provided, four of them new).

McColl Elementary/Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Wallace Elementary/Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

MCCORMICK COUNTY SCHOOLSMcCormick High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

McCormick Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

NEWBERRY COUNTY SCHOOLSBoundary Street Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$13,792 spent; \$7,910 explained).

Gallman Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$17,500 spent; \$9,285 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Five activities reported, three new to the school).

Newberry High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Good	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6

Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: None.

Newberry Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$20,000 spent; \$9,288 explained).

Whitmire Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

ORANGEBURG COUNTY CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT 3

Ellore Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 3
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$20,700 spent; \$14,209 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (Three activities provided, all of them new).

Holly Hill Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0
Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$19,350 spent; \$0 explained).
Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).
Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Holly Hill Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 4
Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 3
Deficiencies: None.

Lake Marion High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 N/A	2004 Below Average	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	-------------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6
Number of Activities Continued: 6 Number of New Activities: 1
Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$47,011 spent; \$26,000 explained).

Vance-Providence Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$11,700 spent; \$0 explained).

Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).

Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.

Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

ORANGEBURG COUNTY CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT 4Branchville High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Excellent	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Good	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Carver-Edisto Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$33,640 spent; \$5,600 explained).

Hunter-Kinard-Tyler Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 6 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Hunter-Kinard-Tyler Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$14,627 spent; \$10,000 explained).

ORANGEBURG COUNTY CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT 5

Bethune-Bowman Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$10,000 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the
 change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No
 activities provided).
 Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new
 behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
 Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision
 making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with
 feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Bethune-Bowman High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 7 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Brookdale Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

Dover Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

North Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6
 Number of Activities Continued: 7 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Orangeburg-Wilkinson Sr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Good	2003 Good	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 7

Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: None.

Rivelon Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$10,822 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).
 Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
 Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Robert E. Howard Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: None.

William J. Clark Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$26,654 spent; \$19,331 explained).

RICHLAND COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 1Alcorn Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$22,725 spent; \$12,200 explained).

Annie Burnside Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: None.

Burton/Virginia Pack Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

C. A. Johnson Preparatory School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

Carver/Lyon Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Eau Claire High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$34,650 spent; \$10,000 explained).

Edward E. Taylor Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Heyward Gibbes Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$22,725 spent; \$16,000 explained).

Hopkins Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 0 Number Matching SRP: 0

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$23,616 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).
 Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.
 Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Hyatt Park Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$19,609 spent; \$900 explained).

John P. Thomas Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Logan Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$13,050 spent; \$10,100 explained).

Lower Richland High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Sarah Nance Elementary/Watkins Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Southeast Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 3
 Deficiencies: None.

St. Andrews Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$29,520 spent; \$10,000 explained).

W. A. Perry Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

Webber Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$14,625 spent; \$0 explained).
 Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the
 change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (One
 activities provided, new to the school).

W. G. Sanders Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

W. J. Keenan High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	-----------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$25,920 spent; \$17,300 explained).

SALUDA COUNTY SCHOOLSSaluda Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: None.

Saluda Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$16,650 spent; \$3,000 explained).

SPARTANBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 6Fairforest Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$11,435 spent; \$8,192 explained).

SPARTANBURG COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 7Carver Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 6 Number Matching SRP: 5

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 3

Deficiencies: None.

Cleveland Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 0

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$19,350 spent; \$0 explained).

Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).

Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.

Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Mary H. Wright Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Myles W. Whitlock Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Unsatisfactory	2003 Unsatisfactory	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 7 Number Matching SRP: 6

Number of Activities Continued: 5 Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$30,150 spent; \$7,700 explained).

Park Hills Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 0 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$16,650 spent; \$1 explained).

Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (One activities provided, new to the school).

W. Herbert Chapman Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Z. L. Madden Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$35,537 spent; \$13,064 explained).

SUMTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 17**Chestnut Oaks Middle School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$29,000 spent; \$10,500 explained).

SUMTER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 2**Furman Middle School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$10,000 spent; \$4,500 explained).

Lakewood High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Excellent	2003 Good	2002 Below Average	2001 Good
-----------------	------	-----------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$55,673 spent; \$3,750 explained).

Mayewood Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Unsatisfactory	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3 Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$6,349 spent; \$0 explained).

Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).

Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.

Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

R. E. Davis Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	--------------	--------------	--------------------	--------------	--------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3

Number Matching SRP: 2

Number of Activities Continued: 2

Number of New Activities: 1

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$22,000 spent; \$5,410 explained).

UNION COUNTY SCHOOLS**Jonesville Elementary School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3

Number Matching SRP: 1

Number of Activities Continued: 3

Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$345 spent; \$0 explained).

Funds were not expended in a manner that addressed the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. (No activities provided).

Funds were not expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers.

Funds were not expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants.

Jonesville Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4

Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 2

Number of New Activities: 2

Deficiencies: None.

Sims Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 3

Number Matching SRP: 3

Number of Activities Continued: 3

Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: None.

WILLIAMSBURG COUNTY SCHOOLS**Battery Park Elementary School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Good	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------	-----------	--------------	----------	----------

Number of Activities Reported: 5

Number Matching SRP: 4

Number of Activities Continued: 5

Number of New Activities: 0

Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$3,977 spent; \$2,572 explained).

C. E. Murray Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$17,861 spent; \$6,300 explained).

D. P. Cooper Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 0
 Deficiencies: None.

Hemingway Middle/High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported: 1 Number Matching SRP: 1
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: Insufficient explanation of total expenditure. (\$20,475 spent; \$4,000 explained).

Kingstree Jr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 4 Number Matching SRP: 3
 Number of Activities Continued: 2 Number of New Activities: 2
 Deficiencies: None.

Kingstree Sr. High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Average	2004 Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 5 Number Matching SRP: 5
 Number of Activities Continued: 4 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

YORK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3Sunset Park Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Below Average
-----------------	------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Number of Activities Reported: 2 Number Matching SRP: 2
 Number of Activities Continued: 1 Number of New Activities: 1
 Deficiencies: None.

STATE SPECIAL SCHOOLS

Felton Laboratory School at South Carolina State University

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 Unsatisfactory	2001 Average
--------------------	------	--------------------------	--------------	-----------------	------------------------	-----------------

Number of Activities Reported:	2	Number Matching SRP:	2
Number of Activities Continued:	1	Number of New Activities:	1
Deficiencies: None.			

SCHOOLS RECEIVING FUNDING FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 2005-06

AIKEN COUNTY SCHOOLS

Leavelle-McCampbell Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None

ANDERSON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT 3

Starr-Iva Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 7

Deficiencies: None

BARNWELL COUNTY DISTRICT 19

Macedonia Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Below Average	2002 Below Average	2001 Unsatisfactory
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None

BARNWELL COUNTY DISTRICT 29

Kelly Edwards Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None

BARNWELL COUNTY DISTRICT 45

Barnwell Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 N/A	2003 N/A	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None

BEAUFORT COUNTY SCHOOLS

Daufuskie Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Good	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None

St. Helena Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None

CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTJames Simons Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None

Ladson Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

McClellanville Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

St. James-Santee Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None.

CHEROKEE COUNTY SCHOOLSAlma Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Blacksburg Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Good
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None.

Blacksburg Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 4

Deficiencies: None.

Granard Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

CHESTER COUNTY SCHOOLSChester Park Complex School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

Chester Park Elementary School of Literacy

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 N/A	2003 N/A	2002 N/A	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Great Falls Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLSLong Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None.

New Heights Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

COLLETON COUNTY SCHOOLSCottageville Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

DILLON COUNTY DISTRICT 1Lake View Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Good	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None.

DILLON COUNTY DISTRICT 3Latta Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY SCHOOLSMcCrorey-Liston Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

FLORENCE COUNTY DISTRICT 1Savannah Grove Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Good	2001 Good
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------	--------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

FLORENCE COUNTY DISTRICT 3Main Street Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Below Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 3

Deficiencies: None.

GREENVILLE COUNTY SCHOOLSNorthwest Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 3

Deficiencies: None.

Sue Cleveland Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

GREENWOOD SCHOOL DISTRICT 50**Brewer Middle School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Good	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

East End Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

KERSHAW COUNTY SCHOOLS**Midway Elementary School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

North Central High School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Good	2003 Average	2002 Good	2001 Good
-----------------	------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------------	--------------	--------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

LANCASTER COUNTY SCHOOLS**Andrew Jackson Middle School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Brooklyn Springs Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 3

Deficiencies: None.

LAURENS SCHOOL DISTRICT 55**Sanders Middle School**

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

LAURENS SCHOOL DISTRICT 56Clinton Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

LEXINGTON COUNTY DISTRICT 2Cyril S Busbee Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 5

Deficiencies: None.

George I Pair Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Good
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None.

LEXINGTON COUNTY DISTRICT 3Batesburg-Leesville Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

LEXINGTON COUNTY DISTRICT 4Sandhills Intermediate School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 N/A
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

ORANGEBURG COUNTY DISTRICT 4Edisto Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

RICHLAND COUNTY DISTRICT 1Arden Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Mill Creek Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 1

Deficiencies: None.

William S. Sandel Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

SPARTANBURG COUNTY DISTRICT 7Houston Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

SUMTER COUNTY DISTRICT 17Lemira Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

WILLIAMSBURG COUNTY SCHOOLGreeleyville Elementary School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 2

Deficiencies: None.

YORK COUNTY DISTRICT 3Castle Heights Middle School

Absolute Rating	2006	2005 Below Average	2004 Average	2003 Average	2002 Average	2001 Average
-----------------	------	-----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

Number of Planning Activities Reported: 0

Deficiencies: None.

Appendix B

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY

ACT OF 1998

Guidelines for Retraining Assistance Program for School Faculty and Administration

Issued by the South Carolina Department of Education

Inez M. Tenenbaum
State Superintendent of Education

Revised and Approved by
The State Board of Education
May 12, 2004

South Carolina Education Accountability Act of 1998

Guidelines for Retraining Assistance Program for School Faculty and Administration

I. Purpose of Funds

The purpose of these funds is to add one component to the many strategies that are to be combined by the districts to meet the intent of the Education Accountability Act to improve teaching and learning so that students are equipped with a strong academic foundation. These specific funds will support needed retraining of school faculty and administration in individual schools. Funds made available through this program are limited solely for professional development (retraining) activities identified as part of the revised school renewal plan. These funds must be used to enhance or provide additional opportunities and not replace any existing funds available for professional development initiatives already underway within the school/district.

These guidelines, established by the State Board of Education through the provisions of the Education Accountability Act of 1998, delineate (1) who is eligible to receive funds, (2) how funds will be distributed, (3) what activities must be completed to direct the expenditure of available funds, and (4) what procedures govern the expenditure of the funds.

II. Eligibility Criteria

- A. Schools rated unsatisfactory or below average on the school report cards are eligible to receive retraining funds for three years, provided that the planning requirements described in these guidelines are fulfilled. Funding will be allocated to the school districts on behalf of the eligible schools on a per teacher basis for use only as outlined in the revised school renewal plan or for "preapproved" activities identified by the State Department of Education (SDE).
- B. Until revised plans are received and approved by the SDE, acting for the State Board of Education, schools may apply to access the retraining funds by submitting a superintendent-approved draft of the applicable portions of the revised plan or, for newly identified schools, by satisfactorily completing the Office of School Quality application form for "preapproved" activities.
- C. The faculty of the school, with leadership of the principal, must review the school renewal plan and revise it with the assistance of the school improvement council. A model process developed by the SDE will direct the school's effort during the revision procedures. The model process will ensure the plan contains sufficiently high standards and expectations for improvement. The SDE will provide training in the model revision process to school renewal planning teams. The principal, as a member of the school planning team, must attend the training. The Office of School Quality may grant exceptions upon request and upon receipt of sufficient documentation justifying the exception from the district superintendent.

III. Implementation Procedures

The funds made available in this program are only for professional development (retraining) activities and must support the implementation of an approved revised school renewal plan and the improvement of student academic performance. Retraining activities must comply with the revised National Staff Development Council's *Standards for Staff Development*. **However, these funds must be used to enhance other professional development funds and may not be used to supplant any existing funds already available for professional development activities.**

IV. Fiscal and Technical Requirements

A. Submission Procedures:

1. Schools that are newly identified for technical assistance during the current fiscal year must submit their revised school renewal plans to the SDE's Office of School Quality by April 30 of each fiscal year. The plans must incorporate "preapproved" activities as well as other activities for which retraining funds are requested.
2. All plans must be sent or delivered to the Office of School Quality, State Department of Education, 701 Rutledge Building, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.

B. Funding Period:

1. The funding period will be from July 1 through June 30 of each fiscal year. All funding and continuances will be contingent upon appropriations from the South Carolina General Assembly.
2. The annual budget year will end June 30 of each fiscal year. If a continuance is granted, there may be provision for a school to "carry over" funds from one fiscal year to the next.
3. Funding may be renewed annually over three years, if school and district actions to implement the revised plan continue. Schools that fail to respond to the survey conducted by the Accountability Division of the Education Oversight Committee (see section V) risk the loss of retraining funds.
4. A school that has received retraining funds for three years may request an extension of funding for up to two additional years. Schools requesting an extension will be directed by a process developed by the SDE. The SDE will make a recommendation to the State Board of Education as to whether an extension is needed to sustain academic improvement. Based upon the recommendations of the SDE, the State Board of Education may grant extensions to schools successfully completing the process.

C. Fiscal Guidelines and Policies:

1. Funding for the Retraining Assistance Program for School Faculty and Administration will be allocated to school districts on behalf of the eligible schools applying for the funds on a per teacher basis. These funds are to be expended exclusively for the professional development activities in the eligible schools as specified in their revised school renewal plans and/or as authorized in their "preapproved" activities application. The funds will be allocated directly to the districts for eligible schools in accordance with the SDE finance procedures.
2. Expenditures for retraining activities must be consistent with allowed expenditures as specified in the SDE's *Funding Manual*.
3. All expenditures of funds are under the authority and jurisdiction of the district superintendent.
4. All expenditures under this program must be audited by a certified public accountant as a part of the district's annual financial audit and must be able to be reviewed using IN\$ITE.

V. Reporting Requirements

The principal of the school, with the assistance of the district office, is to provide annually to the Accountability Division of the Education Oversight Committee such information on retraining funds as requested by the Accountability Division (see appendix). The

information will be provided no later than the end of June unless the deadline is extended by the Accountability Division.

APPENDIX

Accountability Division of the Education Oversight Committee

Process for Review of Retraining Assistance Program 2005–06

The following process is used by the Accountability Division of the Education Oversight Committee for the review of the Retraining Assistance Program for 2005–06.

(1) Overall Process

The Accountability Division of the Education Oversight Committee examines data from three sources to complete the review of expenditures of the Retraining Assistance Program: the School Renewal Plan submitted to the State Department of Education; the information provided by the school on the internet survey sent by the Accountability Division to each participating school; and, the student achievement data from each school. As part of the review, the specific professional development activities listed in the School Renewal Plan are compared to the specific activities the school reports on the internet survey sent by the Accountability Division. Discrepancies between the two lists of activities are noted. Information provided through the internet survey is also analyzed through the criteria for evaluation listed below. Student achievement data are then analyzed for improvement consistent with the goals of the School Renewal Plan.

(2) Statutory Authority

The Education Accountability Act of 1998 (§59-18-1560) establishes grant programs for schools designated as below average or unsatisfactory: “The State Board of Education, working with the Accountability Division and the Department of Education, must establish grant programs for schools designated as below average and for schools designated as unsatisfactory. A school designated as below average will qualify for a grant to undertake any needed retraining of school faculty and administration once the revised plan is determined by the State Department of Education to meet the criteria on high standards and effective activities. A school designated as unsatisfactory will qualify for the grant program after the State Board of Education approves its revised plan. A grant or a portion of a grant may be renewed annually over the next three years, if school and district actions to implement the revised plan continue. Should student performance not improve, any revisions to the plan must meet high standards prior to renewal of the grant. The revised plan must be reviewed by the district and board of trustees and the State Department of Education to determine what other actions, if any, need to be taken. A grant may be extended for up to two additional years, if the State Board of Education determines it is needed to sustain academic improvement. The funds must be expended based on the revised plan and according to criteria established by the State Board of Education. Prior to extending any grant, the Accountability Division shall review school expenditures to make a determination of the effective use of previously awarded grant funds. If deficient use is determined, those deficiencies must be identified, noted, and corrective action taken before a grant extension will be given.”

(3) Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria used for the review of the Retraining Assistance Program include the following, drawn from the State Board of Education-approved Professional Development Standards for South Carolina: The most important element of the retraining assistance program is the improvement of student learning. During the initial two award years, the use of retraining assistance funds is reviewed and presented as advisory only; the third year review is provided to the State Board of Education for its consideration during deliberations to determine if the grant is to be extended. Student achievement data are considered in the third year review. The reviews in each of the three years consider effective use against the professional development standards shown below. Sample indicator questions, drawn from the sample indicators for each listed standard, are also included.

- **Standards 4 and 5:** Funds are expended in a manner to accomplish the acquisition of new behavior and long-term skill improvement by all teachers. Sample indicator questions include:
 - ✓ Are professional development activities scheduled to ensure time for recipients to learn together and improve practice?
 - ✓ Is time for professional development activities provided during the work day (e.g., common planning time, peer observation, etc.)?

- ✓ Are all stakeholders in the school involved in the determination of the professional development activities to be conducted?
- ✓ Are professional development activities held at a time when all stakeholders can attend?
- Standards 2, 5, 7, 9 and 12: Funds are expended in a manner that addresses the three phases of the change process: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. Sample indicator questions include:
 - ✓ Do school leaders participate with staff in professional development activities?
 - ✓ Are all stakeholders in the school involved in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the professional development activities conducted?
 - ✓ Is collaboration occurring among the teachers at the school to support change and innovation?
 - ✓ Are the professional development activities designed to relate to ongoing programs at the school?
 - ✓ Are follow-up opportunities provided for all professional development activities, and are the follow-up opportunities monitored and supported with human and financial resources?
- Standards 3 and 8: Funds are expended on activities chosen through data-driven decision making, that are research-based and provide theory, demonstration, practice with feedback, and follow-up for all participants. Sample indicator questions include:
 - ✓ Are professional development activities aligned with the school improvement plans?
 - ✓ Are the professional development activities chosen after careful analysis of disaggregated data?
 - ✓ Are professional development activities designed to address gaps in achievement among all student groups?
- Standards 6 and 11: Funds are expended in a manner that recognizes differing levels of educator expertise (i. e., diverse participant needs) in regards to content knowledge and pedagogical practices. Sample indicator questions include:
 - ✓ Are the professional development activities presented by credible providers?
 - ✓ Are the professional development activities presented in multiple formats (e.g, action research, self-study, training, etc.)?
 - ✓ Do all training activities provide theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching opportunities?

(4) Data Sources

- Guidelines for Retraining Assistance Program
- NSDC Standards for Staff Development
- Professional Development Standards for South Carolina
- School Renewal Plans
- School Survey Responses
- Student achievement data (PACT, HSAP, EOCEP, AP, etc.)

(5) Time Line

	<u>Time frame</u>	<u>Involved Parties</u>
Superintendents notified survey to be sent to principals	early May	EOC, LEAs
Survey sent to principals, with instructions on how to complete the survey and reply deadline	early May	EOC, LEAs
Superintendents notified of response status of schools in district regarding the survey	mid-June	EOC, LEAs
*Superintendents notified of schools not replying to survey	mid-July	EOC, LEAs
*State Board of Education notified of schools not replying to survey	mid-July	EOC, SBE
Analyze non-achievement components of the data, including survey on demographics and attitudes, activities reported by the schools and the School Renewal Plan	July-August	EOC, SDE

Superintendents and principals notified of non-achievement data analysis, request documentation of inaccurate data deadline three weeks after sent	October	EOC, LEAs
Add school achievement data to other data	As available	EOC
Draft with detail on deficiencies provided to superintendents and principals of schools, request documentation of inaccurate data	mid-Nov	EOC, LEAs
Present final report to EIA Subcommittee and full EOC	mid-Dec	EOC
Forward recommendations to SBE, following EOC action	mid-Dec	EOC

*These steps provided pending adoption in the FY05 budget of the revision to Proviso 1A.48: "Furthermore, any school that does not provide the evaluation information necessary to determine effective use as required by Section 59-18-1560 is not eligible to receive additional funding until the requested data is provided as outlined in the program guidelines."

Appendix C

General Information on the Retraining Assistance Program
Survey Year
2005-2006

SCHOOL INFORMATION

Beds Code

School

District

Principal

Email Address

Telephone

Amount Awarded 04-05*

Amount Awarded 05-06*

Amount Expended by school in 2005-2006

Fiscal Years in Retraining Assistance Program

1 2 3 4 5 5+

Were you aware that Proviso 1A.48 of the 2005-06 General Appropriations Act

If yes, how much? Please explain.

allows a combination of RAP funds with

Yes

No

Homework Center funds to provide

Don't Know

Professional Development or Extended

School Day?

Did the School Renewal Plan change significantly from 2004-05 to 2005-06?

Yes

No

If yes, please email a copy of the updated plan to Paul Horne at phorne@eoc.state.sc.us.

Instructional liaison who significantly contributed to the revision of the School Renewal Plan.

Teacher Specialist

SDE Curriculum Specialist

Principal Leader

CIF

Office of School Quality

PRINCIPAL INFORMATION

Number of years the principal has been at the school.

Number of years the principal has been a principal at any school.

Number of years the principal has worked in the field of education.

Certificated Level

BA BA+18 M.Ed M+30 Ph. D

TEACHER INFORMATION

(Note: Answers to Items 2,3, and 4 must equal Item 1.)

Total number of certificated staff positions including administrators, media, guidance, etc.

1. Number of teaching positions at the school

2 Number of positions with certified teachers

3. Number of positions out of or without certification

4. Number of positions with critical needs permits.

5. Number of teachers in each range according to years of total experience. (Total must equal Item #1)

First Year [] 1 - 5 [] 6 - 10 [] 11 - 15 [] 16 + []

6. Number of teachers in each range according to how long at this school. (Total must equal Item #1)

First Year [] 1 - 5 [] 6 - 10 [] 11 - 15 [] 16 + []

7. Number of unduplicated teachers in each category. (One teacher is one Certificated Level - Total must equal Item #1)

Bachelors [] Bachelors +18 [] Masters [] Masters +30 [] Doctorate [] Not Certificated []

8. Number of teachers in each range according to how far they travel to the school.

1 - 10 miles [] 11 - 25 miles [] Over 25 miles []

9. Number of teachers not returning for any reason next year.

[]

LIKERT SCALE INFORMATION

Answer the questions about the Retraining Grant Program using the pull-down menu, which includes a Likert scale of:
Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree.

Section I. The Program

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. Teachers benefited from the program. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| b. Teachers used in class what they learned. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| c. Teachers felt pressured by the program. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| d. Student achievement was affected positively. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| e. Staff responsibilities for activities were identified. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| f. The program fostered improved instruction. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| g. Procedures existed to evaluate effectiveness of the program based on student needs and state assessment scores. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| h. Procedures existed to evaluate effectiveness of the program based on the school's Parental Involvement Goal(s). | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |

Section II. Funding

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. Funding was available in a timely manner. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| b. Funding was available for innovative professional development. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| c. The program adequately supported the implementation of the School Renewal Plan. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| d. District procurement procedures did not hinder the process. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| e. SDE procurement procedures did not hinder the process. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| f. Consultant resources were available. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |

Section III. The Planning Process

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. Guidelines for the Retraining Assistance Program were clear. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| b. The SDE Model Revision Process for the program were practical. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| c. SDE assistance was available. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| d. SDE assistance was utilized. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| e. Timeline for the Retraining Grant did not hinder. Implementation. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| f. Faculty was involved in the planning process. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |

Section IV. Support

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. The school board was supportive of the Retraining Assistance Program activities. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| b. The superintendent was supportive of the Retraining Assistance Program activities. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |

Section V. Professional Development

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| a. Professional development was scheduled to minimize teacher absences during class time. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| b. Professional development was scheduled at times teachers could attend. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| c. Each activity was evaluated for effectiveness throughout the year. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| d. Teachers had adequate time to practice skills learned. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| e. Professional development emphasized active participant involvement. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| f. Professional development activities were based on research. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| g. Professional development activities were aligned with previous activities. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| h. Administrators participated in the professional development activities with teachers. | <i>Strongly_Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly_Disagree</i> |
| i. List evidence, other than test scores, of the effectiveness of your Retraining Assistance Program (i.e., improved discipline, increased instructional time, increased student attendance). | |
| j. Using the program descriptor or terminology from your School Renewal Plan, please list the title(s) of all activities that were funded with Retraining Assistance funds in previous years that are continuing at the school but for which no additional Retraining Assistance funds are needed. No explanation needed. | |

Retraining Assistance Program
Survey Year
2005-2006

Sample Activity Form					
Activity Number		School			
1. Activity Name					
2. This activity was a continuation of a previous activity.					Yes No
a.) If yes, how many years has this activity been ongoing?					
3. Primary person who presented this activity					
Administrator	Teacher Specialist/Teacher	District Staff/Consultant	SDE Personnel	Other	
4. Primary person responsible for implementation of this activity at this site					
Principal	Assistant Principal	Lead Teacher	District Staff	Other	
5. Primary format of professional development offered <i>(See Descriptions listed Below)</i>					
<i>Individually-guided</i> - Learning designed by the teacher that relates to the school renewal plan <i>Inquiry</i> - Action research/Collegial study groups <i>Participation in a process</i> - Curriculum development/School improvement <i>Teacher Observation</i> - Peer coaching/Clinical supervision/Teacher evaluation <i>Training</i> - Participation in a course, workshop, or seminar, or conference on site <i>Workshop Off Site</i> - Workshop or conference off site					
6. Describe the professional development activity and how it relates to the School Renewal Plan.					
7. Primary Content Area <i>(See Descriptions listed Below)</i>					
<i>Content and Standards</i> <i>Pedagogy</i> <i>Professional Growth</i> (Stress Management/Cultural Diversity) <i>School Climate</i> (Faculty & Staff Morale/Classroom management/Discipline/Safety) <i>Strategic Planning</i> (Analyzing Test Data/School and Community Relations/Planning Retreats) <i>Technology</i> <i>Increased Parental Involvement</i>					
8. Number of teachers who participated.					
9. Number of administrators who participated.					
10. Number of teacher specialists who participated, if applicable.					
11. Amount of funds encumbered or expended for this activity.					
12. Primary method used to determine if participant knowledge or skill increased during school year.					
Demonstration Lesson	Learning Assessment	Lesson Plan	Personal Learning Log	Observation	Teacher Interview

13. Type of follow-up provided directly related to this activity.					
Classroom visitation by principal	Classroom visitation by asst. principal	Classroom visitation by another teacher	Classroom visitation by consultant	Personal Learning Log	Teacher portfolios
14. How many follow-up activities occurred for this activity?					
None	1	2	3 or More		
15. Primary manner in which this activity is supported by the administration.					
Administrators participate with teachers	Teachers encouraged to collaborate with other teachers		Administrators provide time for teacher collaboration		